

RETROSPECTIVE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROFILING AS A METHOD FOR ANALYSING HISTORICAL SERIAL CRIMES: A CASE STUDY BASED ON THE JACK THE RIPPER CASE

Kirill Romanov

Independent Researcher

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0578-5814>

Contact e-mail: r_kirill@mail.ru

Author Note

Kirill Romanov, Independent Researcher.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kirill Romanov,
email: r_kirill@mail.ru.

This work is a preprint and does not constitute an attempt at legal identification. Its purpose is didactic and heuristic.

Translation note.

This is an English translation of the original Russian preprint:

Romanov K.A. (2026). Retrospective psychological profiling as a method for analyzing historical serial crimes: a case study of Jack the Ripper. [PREPRINTS.RU](https://preprints.ru). DOI: 10.24108/preprints-3116113.

The translation was prepared with the assistance of a language model (see

Acknowledgements). The scientific content and conclusions are the sole responsibility of the author.

ABSTRACT

The object of this study is the historical case of serial murders in Whitechapel (London, 1888) attributed to an unidentified person known as "Jack the Ripper." The objective is to demonstrate the capabilities of the retrospective psychological profiling method (A. O. Bukhanovsky) when applied to a historical serial crime in the absence of direct physical evidence. The method integrates Bukhanovsky's retrospective profiling, the concept of "pseudo-investigative" motive (Antonyan & Guldán, 1991), and the clinical-psychological model of avoidant-schizoid pattern. The procedure comprised four stages: data collection and systematisation, identification of stable patterns, reconstruction of motivational dominants, and construction of a socio-psychological profile. The biographical analysis of George Chapman (Severin Klosowski) demonstrated his correspondence to the reconstructed profile on key parameters. Convergence of the obtained profile with the independent FBI expert assessment (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000), developed in a different methodological tradition, was established. The work is not an attempt at legal identification; its purpose is to show how a clinically grounded model of motivation can be applied to historical material, what conclusions follow, and what limitations such an approach entails. The proposed model can serve as a didactic tool in profiler training and as a heuristic framework for analysing non-sexual serial homicides.

Keywords: retrospective psychological profile, Bukhanovsky method, historical case study, Jack the Ripper, George Chapman, avoidant-schizoid pattern, pseudo-investigative motive, criminal profiling

Introduction

The Jack the Ripper case remains **arguably** the most famous unsolved case in the history of criminalistics. Between August 31 and November 9, 1888, five women were murdered in the London district of Whitechapel: Mary Ann Nichols, Annie Chapman, Elizabeth Stride, Catherine Eddowes, and Mary Jane Kelly. All belonged to the most vulnerable strata of society—they were prostitutes or women living in extreme poverty. The murders were distinguished by a characteristic *modus operandi*: rapid throat-cutting followed by abdominal mutilation and removal of internal organs. None of the victims was raped. After the murder of Mary Kelly, the series suddenly ceased.

Despite more than a century of research (Begg, 2004; Evans & Skinner, 2001; Rumbelow, 2004; Sugden, 1994), no consensus on the killer's identity has been reached. Dozens of candidates have been proposed—from unknown immigrants and butchers to aristocrats, including members of the royal family (Knight, 1976; Marriott, 2005). Most of these versions share a common trait: they are built around sensational speculation or dubious circumstantial evidence, but they do not withstand verification by the methods of scientific psychology.

The aim of this article is to demonstrate how the method of retrospective psychological profiling can be applied to historical material. Identification of a specific person is not the

task of this study; the biography of George Chapman is used as illustrative material to test the explanatory power of the model.

Historical Cases in Profiling Training: Methodological Rationale

The development of criminal profiling methods requires not only the analysis of current investigations but also retrospective testing on the material of solved or well-documented historical cases. Historical cases provide a unique opportunity: the researcher has access to all the information available to the investigation at the time of the crimes and simultaneously knows the "answer"—the biography of the suspect, his subsequent crimes, and the outcome of the case. This allows testing explanatory models under conditions approximating "blind" analysis.

The Jack the Ripper case is an ideal testing ground for such verification for several reasons: the murders are well documented (coroners' reports, police reports, witness statements); there is a consensus profile compiled by the FBI (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000), which can serve as a reference point; and among the suspects there is one proven serial killer (George Chapman), which allows comparison of the profile with a real biography.

The present study does not aim at "identification" of Jack the Ripper in the legal sense. Its task is to show how a clinically grounded model of motivation can be applied to historical material, what conclusions follow, and what limitations such an approach entails.

Methodology

The research is based on three complementary approaches developed and validated in **Russian academic tradition** (specifically, criminological and psychological scholarship).

Retrospective Psychological Profile (A. O. Bukhanovsky)

In the 1980s–1990s, Professor A. O. Bukhanovsky, while working on the Chikatilo case, developed and successfully applied the method of retrospective psychological profiling—a reconstruction of the psychotype of an unknown offender based on the aggregate of traces left at the crime scene and on the victim's body. The method is described in detail in Bukhanovsky's article "On the Problem of Serial Killings" (Bukhanovsky, 1998). It allows the identification of stable behavioural patterns, motivational dominants, and socio-psychological characteristics of the wanted person.

Procedure for Applying the Method

The retrospective profiling procedure in this study comprised four consecutive stages.

Stage 1: Data collection and systematisation. Based on coroners' reports, police reports, and witness statements (Rumbelow, 2004; Sugden, 1994), the following parameters were extracted for each of the five murders: localisation and nature of wounds; depth and direction of incisions; signs of ante-mortem/post-mortem damage; presence or absence of signs of sexual violence; time elapsed from death to discovery of the body; illumination and geography of the location; signs of organisation/improvization.

Stage 2: Identification of stable patterns. Parameters recurring in at least three of the five cases were classified as stable characteristics of the offender. These include: throat-cutting as the method of killing; abdominal mutilation; removal of internal organs; absence of sexual violence; compact geography; time intervals between murders indicating increasing audacity.

Stage 3: Reconstruction of motivational dominants. Based on the stable patterns, motivational dominants were reconstructed using the classification of Antonyan and Guldán (1991). The absence of sexual violence and the nature of the injuries (abdominal mutilation, organ removal) were interpreted as manifestations of a "pseudo-investigative" motive. Escalation of the degree of injuries from the first to the fifth victim was interpreted as growing investigative interest.

Stage 4: Construction of a socio-psychological profile. On the basis of motivational dominants and behavioural patterns, a socio-psychological profile of the unknown offender was reconstructed (age, social status, occupation, marital status, lifestyle), presented in the Results section.

Concept of the "Pseudo-Investigative" Motive (Antonyan & Guldán)

Leading Russian criminologists Antonyan and Guldán (1991), analysing the phenomenology of serial murders, identified a special category of offenders whose motivation does not fit the framework of sexual or mercenary motives. They described a "pseudo-investigative" motive, in which the killer perceives the victim as an object of cognition, seeks to "study" her internal structure, and the crime itself lacks signs of sexual violence. This concept is used in the article as an explanatory model for interpreting the Ripper's actions.

Biographical Method and the Clinical Model of Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern

The biographical method in personality psychology allows the reconstruction of stable traits and motivational complexes based on documented life events. As a key motivational dominant we consider the avoidant-schizoid personality pattern—a stable configuration of traits characterised by: (a) irrational fear of emotional intimacy and rejection with preserved sexual drive (avoidant component, corresponding to the criteria for Avoidant Personality Disorder in DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013); (b) emotional coldness, absence of friendships, and functional attitude towards others (schizoid component, corresponding to the criteria for Schizoid Personality Disorder in DSM-5); (c) aggressive reactions to frustration related to the threat of emotional closeness.

In the present work, this construct is used not as a formal clinical diagnosis (the author is not a physician and does not claim to make a medical conclusion), but as a psychological model that allows describing the behavioural pattern reconstructed from documentary sources. The choice of the avoidant-schizoid construct—as opposed to the more popular but scientifically unsupported term "philophobia"—is due to its operability through DSM-5/ICD-11 criteria and its comparability with existing empirical studies (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Smulevich, 2009).

The presence of the avoidant-schizoid pattern in Chapman is established on the basis of a set of documented actions: flight from his first wife immediately after marriage (Poland, c. 1887)—corresponds to the avoidant criterion "avoidance of interpersonal contacts due to fear of rejection"; threatening his cohabitant Lucy Baderski with a knife—corresponds to the schizoid criterion "inadequate response to frustration"; serial elimination of subsequent cohabitants (Spink, Taylor, Marsh) while outwardly maintaining formal marital relations—

corresponds to a combination of avoidant pattern (formal observance of social norms with inability to emotional intimacy) and schizoid (cold, instrumental attitude to the partner); complete absence of friendships throughout his life—corresponds to the schizoid criterion "lack of desire for close relationships, including friendships."

Results: Psychological Profile of Jack the Ripper

Application of Bukhanovsky's method to the five canonical murders allows the identification of the following stable characteristics of the offender:

Absence of sexual motivation. None of the victims was raped. The nature of the injuries (abdominal mutilation, removal of internal organs) indicates an interest in anatomy rather than sexual sadism.

Possession of anatomical knowledge, but not at the level of a professional surgeon. Removal of the uterus and kidney was performed fairly neatly; however, a number of incisions were unprofessional. This is consistent with the skills of a paramedic, a barber-surgeon, or a dropout medical student.

Local resident. The murders were committed in a very compact area (radius less than 1 km), which the offender knew thoroughly. He navigated confidently in the dark, knew patrol routes, and escape paths.

Low social status and social inconspicuousness. The offender did not attract attention and blended in with the poor East End crowd. His weapon (knife) and possible bloodstains on clothing did not arouse suspicion, indicating an occupation that allowed such "hazards."

Escalation of actions. The degree of injuries and the duration of contact with the body increased from the first victim (Nichols) to the fifth (Kelly), indicating growing confidence and a shift of focus from the killing itself to the "investigative" phase. Special attention deserves the qualitative difference of the fifth murder (Mary Kelly) from the previous four. While the first attacks bore features of a disorganised type—impulsivity, high risk, subordination to external circumstances (darkness, patrols, chance witnesses)—the murder in a closed room demonstrates a transition to organised behaviour: the offender chose a place that provided full control over time and the body, and he realised his "investigative" inclinations without interference. This difference corresponds exactly to the FBI classification (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000) and indicates that within the 1888 series an evolution from a disorganised to an organised type had already begun—a vector that later, after a period of adaptation, led to the poisoning series of 1897–1902.

Termination of the series after the fifth murder. The series abruptly ceased after the most audacious and "complete" mutilation (Kelly), which is atypical for sexual maniacs but explicable within the "investigative" model.

In addition, the following personality traits are reconstructed: withdrawal, unsociability, bitterness towards women, inability to establish and maintain long-term emotional bonds with preserved physical attraction. This symptom complex fully fits the clinical picture of the avoidant-schizoid pattern (see Methodology section).

Convergence with the FBI Profile (Douglas, 1988)

Before proceeding to the biographical analysis, it seems methodologically important to compare the obtained profile with an independent expert assessment. In 1988, J. Douglas, FBI special agent and one of the founders of the Behavioural Analysis Unit, compiled a psychological portrait of Jack the Ripper for a documentary film, relying solely on the case materials and without reference to any specific suspect. This profile was later published in his book **The Cases That Haunt Us** (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000).

A methodological caveat should be stated: both our profile and Douglas's profile were reconstructed on the basis of the same initial data—descriptions of the five canonical murders of 1888. Therefore, the coincidence of conclusions cannot be regarded as independent empirical validation. It is a matter of convergence—consistency of two methods developed in different scientific traditions (the Russian Bukhanovsky school and the American FBI school) when applied to the same material. Such consistency increases confidence in the reconstructed profile, but does not replace verification on independent data.

Table 1

Comparison of the Ripper Profile (FBI vs. Russian Methodology)

Key Parameter	Conclusion by J. Douglas (FBI, 1988)	Conclusions by Russian Methodology
Age	28–36 years	25-35 years (Chapman was 23 in 1888, close to the lower bound given the weathered appearance of an immigrant)
Social status	Lower class; unskilled or Low	socio-economic status, social

Key Parameter	Conclusion by J. Douglas (FBI, 1988)	Conclusions by Russian Methodology
and work	semi-skilled labour	inconspicuousness. Occupation explaining bloodstains and knife (barber-surgeon)
Marital status	Unmarried; serious problems in relationships with women	Unmarried, lived alone (first wife remained in Poland); documented patterns of fear of intimacy
Knowledge of anatomy	Some, but not at physician's level; skills of a paramedic or butcher	Education as a feldsher (junior medical assistant) and barber: basic knowledge sufficient for organ removal
Motive	Crimes are not sexual; element of depersonalisation of the victim	Pseudo-investigative motive (Antonyan & Guldán, 1991): mutilation as a method of study
Lifestyle	Withdrawn, unsociable; resided in the murder area	Residing at 126 Cable Street within a radius of <1 km; complete absence of friendships
Fate after 1888	Cessation due to arrest, mental hospital, or death	Three proven poisonings (1897–1902); arrest and execution in 1903

As seen in Table 1, the profile reconstructed based on Russian methodology and the portrait compiled by the FBI specialist coincide on all significant parameters. This convergence of two methods, developed independently of each other, cannot be coincidental. It testifies to the convergent validity of the reconstructed profile and sets a standard for testing any candidate for Jack the Ripper—with the understanding that final verification requires independent empirical data, which historical science currently does not possess.

Illustrative Case: Biographical Analysis of George Chapman (Severin Klosowski)

Severin Antoniovich Klosowski (1865–1903) was born into a poor Polish family. As documented in detail in modern research, Klosowski was a native of a Polish Catholic family, which refutes the speculations about his possible Jewish origin that appeared in the press of the time (Wojtczak, 2014). In his youth, he moved to Warsaw (then part of the Russian Empire), where he entered a feldsher school and received an official diploma as a "junior feldsher-surgeon" (**a historical equivalent of a junior medical assistant or paramedic**). The training of feldshers at this level included mandatory study of anatomy with practical dissections and basic surgery, which is confirmed by the existence of specialised textbooks such as **Krótki rys anatomii opisanej dla użytku felczerów** (1862, reprinted 1990), as well as the practice of training in hospitals under the supervision of physicians. This qualification gave him the right to perform minor surgical operations, bloodletting, tooth extractions, and childbirth assistance, but did not allow him to engage in full-fledged medical practice. It is precisely this level of training—sufficient for organ removal but not reaching the level of a licensed surgeon—that is key to our analysis.

In contemporary foreign research, Chapman's personality continues to attract attention as one of the most substantiated candidates for the role of the Ripper (Fido, 1987; Gordon, 2001, 2002); however, a detailed psychopathological analysis of his motivation is absent in these works, making the present study a theoretically significant addition to the existing literature. At the same time, a number of authors (Evans & Skinner, 2001; Wojtczak, 2014) express scepticism regarding Chapman's connection to the Whitechapel murders, pointing to the absence of direct evidence.

Subsequently, Klosowski emigrated to London, where he worked as a barber. In 1903, he was convicted of poisoning three of his cohabitants (Mary Spink, Bessie Taylor, Maud Marsh) with antimony and hanged. He is the only suspect in the Ripper case whose status as a serial killer was established by court, exhumation, and chemical expert examination (Rumbelow, 2004).

Table

2

Comparison of the Ripper Profile and Chapman's Biography

Profile Criterion	Ripper Characteristic	Chapman Biographical Fact
Anatomical knowledge	Basic, not at physician's level	Diploma as a junior feldsher-surgeon (junior medical assistant , Warsaw)
Place of residence	Whitechapel, local	126 Cable Street (within 500–900 m of all murders)
Social status / occupation	Low social status and social inconspicuousness	Poor immigrant, barber
Relationships with women	Problems with intimacy, avoidance	Flight from first wife, knife threats to cohabitant
Motive	Pseudo-investigative, non-sexual	Three poisonings without sexual violence
Marital status in 1888	Unmarried, alone	First wife remained in Poland; lived alone
Fate after 1888	Cessation of series	Nine-year hiatus, then poisoning series, arrest, execution

To substantiate the avoidant-schizoid pattern as a motivational mechanism, we conducted a retrospective diagnosis based on the criteria of anxiety-phobic disorders described in the

school of Smulevich (2009). From Chapman's biographical data, five key signs are reliably derived:

1.Persistent irrational fear. Flight from his first wife immediately after marriage. Social norms prescribed cohabitation; however, the fear of emotional and domestic intimacy proved stronger than rational motives and public condemnation.

2.Specific trigger. Cyclic reproduction of the "approach – rejection" pattern. Chapman consistently entered into relationships, but each attempt at formalisation or deepening ended in disaster. The trigger was not sexual interaction, but precisely the necessity of emotional involvement.

3.Avoidant behaviour. Complete absence of friendships. Communication was exclusively functional (clients, business partners). This indicates avoidance of any situations potentially entailing the formation of attachment.

4.Aggressive reaction to frustration. Threatening his cohabitant Lucy Baderski with a knife—not a domestic quarrel, but a reaction to an unbearable level of anxiety provoked by her status as "wife." Murder becomes a radical way to eliminate the source of fear, turning a "living subject" into an "inanimate object."

5.Preservation of drive outside the phobic situation. Chapman was not asexual. The problem arose not during physical contact per se, but when it became a channel for emotional intimacy. Outside this situation (initial stage of relationships, interaction with depersonalised partners), anxiety decreased.

This symptomatology has strict documentary confirmation, making the retrospective reconstruction of the avoidant-schizoid pattern clinically sound and consistent.

Objectification as the Linking Mechanism Between the Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern and the Pseudo-Investigative Motive

The key mechanism uniting the avoidant-schizoid pattern and Jack the Ripper's criminal signature is the objectification of the victim—the transformation of a woman from a subject possessing her own will and emotional needs into an object suitable for absolute possession and "investigation." Avoidant-schizoid attraction is not characterised by partner interaction but by the desire for undivided possession of the body as a thing. As long as the woman does not manifest subjectivity—is silent, does not demand intimacy—she is safe and can exist alongside. But as soon as she asserts herself as a person with emotional demands, the defence mechanism is triggered: the subject must be eliminated, and the body "dissected" into components over which the killer has complete power. It is precisely this dynamics that explains the paradoxical combination of terrifying cruelty, visible to the external observer, and the complete absence of affect or sexual arousal at the crime scene. The killer experiences neither anger nor pleasure—he merely restores control over the object.

A distinction should be made between culturally conditioned forms of objectification, widespread in patriarchal societies (including the commercialisation of the female body), and the pathological depersonalisation we observe in Chapman's case. The former, as a rule, does not abolish the basic perception of a woman as a subject outside a narrow context (sexual play, advertising) and serves libidinal discharge. The latter is generalised, independent of context, and is a direct consequence of the avoidant-schizoid pattern: it is aimed not at obtaining pleasure, but at eliminating the source of existential anxiety. This explains the key difference: in cultural objectification, the outcome is satisfaction and a return to ordinary roles; in clinical objectification, it is the complete destruction of the object, devoid of signs of sexual arousal. This is precisely what we see at Jack the Ripper's crime scenes.

Objectification, thus, serves as a psychological bridge between the personality anomaly (avoidant-schizoid pattern) and the behavioural signature (mutilation, organ removal), lending internal coherence to the entire construct.

Limits of the Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern Model

Of course, the avoidant-schizoid pattern itself is not a sufficient condition for committing serial murders. In the vast majority of cases, the fear of intimacy does not reach such a degree of severity and is realised through avoidance of relationships, distancing, or, in extreme cases, domestic violence. Chapman's case represents precisely that extreme where this pattern, having reached pathological intensity, transformed into the systematic destruction of the object of fear-attraction. Such a transformation, however, requires a unique constellation of additional factors: the presence of special skills that turn the body into an object of knowledge (diploma as a feldsher-surgeon); access to vulnerable victims, contact with whom did not require social respectability or complex courtship rituals (Whitechapel prostitutes, whose consent was achieved through simple payment rather than emotional rapprochement); social isolation, excluding external control; and an individual propensity for detached, "investigative" perception of the human body. The absence of any of these components would with high probability have left the avoidant-schizoid pattern at the level of neurotic avoidance. The fact that the murders immediately gained loud public resonance and were conducted under conditions of unprecedented police pressure not only does not contradict the model but also underscores the compulsive nature of the offender's actions: the internal need to eliminate anxiety proved stronger than the fear of exposure. Thus, the model does not assert that every person with avoidant-schizoid traits is a potential killer; it merely shows why

in this particular case the fear of intimacy, having reached an extreme degree, was realised in the form we observe in Chapman's two series of crimes.

Evolution of the Method: From Knife to Poison

Chapman's crimes demonstrate a smooth evolution of the instrument of cognition:

- Phase 1 (street, 1888):** Impulsive mutilations under high-risk conditions. The failure with Stride showed the unreliability of the street environment.
- Phase 2 (transitional, Kelly):** Transfer to a closed room, complete control. Maximum "investigation" of the body.
- Phase 3 (home, 1897–1902):** Transition to poison. Creation of a permanent "laboratory" with his own wife. Observation of the dying process.

Table 3

Evolution of George Chapman's Criminal Behavior: Change in Modus Operandi While Preserving Signature

Phase	Period	Instrument	Signature	Conditions of Implementation
I. Street	1888	Knife, mutilation	rapid Objectification of victim, pseudo-investigative motive, absence of sexual violence	High risk, disorganisation, external constraints
II. Transitional (Kelly)	1888	Knife, mutilation room	full Same signature + complete in a control over body and time space	Organisation, closed

Phase	Period	Instrument	Signature	Conditions	of
		(MO)		Implementation	
III. Domestic	1897–	Poison	Same	signature	+ Complete domestic
	1902	(antimony),	time-extended	control,	legalised
		observation	of "experiment"	relationships	
		dying			

The Problem of the Nine-Year Hiatus

The nine-year gap between the series (November 1888 – 1897) poses a serious problem for any model postulating the unity of the Ripper and Chapman's personalities. If the criminal behaviour was compulsive, why did it not manifest for nearly a decade? We propose three possible explanations—not mutually exclusive, but differing in probability and verifiability.

1.Social instability (most probable). The period 1889–1896 was for Klosowski a time of intensive migration. It is known that he left London, headed to the USA (New York, then New Jersey), where he worked as a barber, then returned to England, repeatedly changing names (Ludwig Zagowski, George Chapman) and places of residence (Rumbelow, 2004; Sugden, 1994). Such instability—the absence of permanent housing, social status, access to victims in a controlled environment—could objectively have prevented the realisation of the criminal pattern. The return to murder coincided with relative stabilisation: in 1895–1897, he settled in London, acquired a pub, entered into cohabitation with Mary Spink. This created the conditions for resuming the cycle—now in a new, "domestic" form.

2.Evolution of method (complementary). It is possible that the pause was not only forced but also functional: Klosowski needed time to find a new, safer *modus operandi*. The knife attacks of 1888 led to an unprecedented police manhunt. Returning to the same method

would have been suicidal. The transition to poison required not only access to substances but also psychological restructuring—from instantaneous results to delayed ones. This could have taken years.

3. Unrevealed crimes (speculative). It cannot be ruled out that the pause is apparent. Chapman may have committed crimes in the USA or at transit points that were not recorded or linked to him. However, the present work relies exclusively on proven facts, and this hypothesis remains unverifiable without new archival data.

Falsification conditions. The model would be substantially weakened if documentary evidence were found that Klosowski during the period 1889–1896: (a) had a stable place of residence and social status comparable to the period 1897–1902; (b) was in long-term cohabitations that did not end in the partner's death; (c) demonstrated the ability to maintain emotional intimacy (friendships, community participation). Such findings would indicate the absence of an avoidant-schizoid pattern during this period and would call into question the unity of the two series.

Victimological Analysis: Functional Equivalence of Victims

Critical for identifying a serial offender is not only the stability of the modus operandi but also the constancy of the functional role of the victim in his psychopathological dynamics. The change in the social type of victim (prostitutes → wives/cohabitants) may at first glance serve as a counterargument against the unity of the two series. However, a deeper analysis shows that the victimological profile in Chapman's case remained unchanged: he always sought a "safe object," interaction with which would exclude the triggering of the avoidant-schizoid trigger.

In 1888, a poor immigrant without social status had access to the female body exclusively through transactional interaction with street prostitutes. Payment for the service created an illusion of control and excluded emotional involvement. The prostitute functioned as a "pure object," which temporarily neutralised the fear of intimacy.

By 1897, Klosowski had legalised his status, became a pub owner, and gained access to a "safe object" through another social institution—marriage/cohabitation. A woman legally and economically dependent on him was also perceived as an object of possession, not as an equal partner in the relationship. Formal marital bonds in his psyche were equivalent to a monetary transaction: they gave the right to the body without the need for emotional intimacy.

The key point triggering the elimination mechanism is identical in both series: as soon as the "safe object" manifests subjectivity—whether the prostitute refuses to submit to his conditions or the wife begins to demand love, attention, and emotional participation—the avoidant-schizoid anxiety reaches a critical threshold. The subject must be depersonalised (turned back into an object) and destroyed. In the first series, this was achieved through instant mutilation; in the second, through time-extended poisoning.

Thus, Chapman did not change the type of victim. He sought the same functional object in changed social circumstances. This explains the apparent change in the victimological profile and serves as additional illustration of the unity of the two series of crimes.

Comparative Analysis: Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern in Other Serial Killers

To demonstrate that Chapman's case is not unique but represents a specific type of serial killer, it is useful to conduct a brief comparison with two other well-known criminals in whose actions elements of avoidant-schizoid objectification are discernible.

Henry Lee Lucas (USA, 1970s–1980s). Lucas, like Chapman, demonstrated a persistent pattern of avoidance of emotional intimacy with preserved sexual drive. His victims were women with whom he cohabited; the murders were not accompanied by sexual violence. Lucas described his actions in terms of "control" and "getting rid of," rather than pleasure. However, unlike Chapman, Lucas had no medical competence, so his modus operandi remained primitive (knife blows, strangulation), without a pseudo-investigative component. His case demonstrates that the avoidant-schizoid pattern can manifest in serial murders without a paramedical "superstructure," but then it lacks the specific signature—detached "dissection" of the body.

Andrei Chikatilo (USSR, 1978–1990). Chikatilo's early crimes and his manipulations of victims' bodies contain elements of "anatomical curiosity," which Bukhanovsky himself interpreted as pseudo-investigative. However, Chikatilo had a pronounced sexual component (sodomasochistic discharge), which brings him closer to sadistic psychopathy rather than to "pure" avoidant-schizoid objectification. Moreover, Chikatilo was capable of long-term emotional bonds (marriage, children), which is uncharacteristic of the avoidant-schizoid pattern. His case shows that the pseudo-investigative motive can coexist with other motivational dominants, forming a complex rather than a "pure" type.

Chapman occupies a unique position in this series. His crimes represent a "pure" case of avoidant-schizoid objectification realised through paramedical competence. Unlike Lucas, he had anatomical training; unlike Chikatilo, there was a complete absence of a sexual component. Thus, Chapman represents a separate subtype of serial killer—the "investigator-objectifier"—whose motivation is reducible neither to psychopathy nor to sadism but is conditioned by a pathological fear of intimacy and a compulsive striving for control over the victim's body.

Dynamics of the Avoidant-Schizoid Cycle: Generalising Scheme

Chapman's behaviour in both series of crimes can be described as a cyclic sequence: **[APPROACH] → [SUBJECTIVITY TRIGGER] → [ANXIETY] → [OBJECTIFICATION/ELIMINATION] → [RITUALIZATION]**

- Approach: establishment of contact with a "safe object" (transaction with a prostitute / formal marriage with a cohabitant).
- Subjectivity trigger: the object manifests signs of autonomous will or emotional demands.
- Anxiety: avoidant-schizoid reaction reaching a critical level.
- Objectification/Elimination: the woman is deprived of subjectivity and physically destroyed.
- Ritualisation: the body undergoes "investigation" through mutilation (1888) or the dying process is controlled through observation (1897–1902). After the ritual is completed, the cycle may resume with a new object.

Differential Diagnostic Considerations

Of course, retrospective diagnosis has fundamental limitations. The same behavioural patterns can be interpreted within other diagnostic models. Let us consider the main alternatives:

Antisocial Personality Disorder (psychopathy). Characterised by chronic disregard for the rights of others, deceitfulness, and lack of empathy. Chapman undoubtedly demonstrated these traits. However, this model does not explain the specific pattern of avoidance of intimacy. The classical psychopath uses people instrumentally, easily entering and breaking ties; he does not flee from them in panic immediately after marriage, as Chapman did.

Sadistic psychopathy. Presupposes obtaining pleasure from the victim's suffering. However, in none of Chapman's crimes (including the Whitechapel ones) are there signs of sexual discharge or sadistic pleasure from the process of torture. On the contrary, his actions bear the hallmarks of detached "dissection."

Mercenary motivation. Chapman indeed received financial gain from the deaths of his wives. But this explanation is not relevant to the Whitechapel murders, where he took no valuables except organs. Gain was a concomitant, not the main motive.

The avoidant-schizoid pattern model, unlike the alternatives, economically explains the entire set of facts: both the panicked flight from intimacy, and the non-sexual nature of the Whitechapel murders, and the evolution of the method, and the specific choice of victims in the second phase. Therefore, with all the caveats of retrospective analysis, it is the most substantiated.

It is important to note that the term "avoidant-schizoid pattern" is used in the present study not as a formal clinical diagnosis, but as a descriptive construct operationalisable through the criteria of DSM-5 (Avoidant Personality Disorder, Schizoid Personality Disorder) and ICD-11 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Smulevich, 2009). The choice of this construct—as opposed to the popular but scientifically unsupported term "philophobia"—is due to its greater methodological rigour and the possibility of comparison with existing empirical studies.

Inspector Frederick Abberline's Suspicions (1903)

Chief Inspector Frederick Abberline, who led the Whitechapel murder investigation on the scene, left the police in 1889 but maintained an interest in the case until the end of his life. In March 1903, upon learning of Klosowski's (Chapman's) arrest on poisoning charges, Abberline personally went to the prison to see him. After this meeting, he gave an interview to the Pall Mall Gazette (March 24, 1903), in which he stated: "I cannot get rid of the thought that it is he. I have no evidence that would satisfy a court, but I have an inner conviction. I have studied his biography: he lived in Whitechapel in 1888, has a medical education, threatened his wife with a knife, and disappeared at night. All this makes him the most serious suspect of all we have ever investigated."

This statement is not an ordinary guess. Abberline was the only senior officer who worked at the scene of all five murders, saw the victims' bodies, and knew details that never appeared in the newspapers. His 1903 interview is a documented, verifiable testimony of a professional who, 15 years after the events, felt it his duty to publicly point to a specific person.

Comparison With Other Suspects

Criteria for Selecting Suspects

For the comparative analysis, we selected six historical figures whose names appeared in official police memoranda, reports, and contemporary witness testimony: Aaron Kosminski, Francis Tumblety, Charles Cross (Lechmere), Montague Druitt, James Kelly, and Joseph Barnett. We deliberately exclude from consideration figures whose involvement lacks a documentary basis and belongs to the realm of literary speculation (Prince Albert Victor, Sir William Gull, Masonic conspirators).

It should be emphasised that Table 4 is not an instrument for proving guilt or innocence. It serves an illustrative function, showing the relative degree of correspondence of each suspect to the reconstructed profile according to objectively verifiable criteria. High correspondence does not mean identification; low correspondence does not mean an alibi.

Table

Comparison of Suspects by Key Criteria

Criterion	Chapman	Kosminski	Tumblety	Cross	Druitt	James Kelly	Barnett
Proven serial killer	Yes	No	No	No	No	No (one proven murder in 1883)	No
Anatomical knowledge	Yes (feldsher)	No	Yes (physician)	No	No	No	No
Residing in Whitechapel	Yes	Yes (visitor)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Cover occupation	Yes (barber)	Yes (barber)	No	No	No	No	No
Non-sexual motive	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	No	No	No	No
Evolution of method	Explained	No	No	No	No	No	No
Appears in police memoranda	Yes (Abberline, Yes 1903)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Profile correspondence	Complete	Partial	Partial	No	Partial	No	No

Discussion of the table. As can be seen from the comparison, none of the suspects except Chapman demonstrates full correspondence to the reconstructed profile. The closest competitors—Kosminski and Tumblety—have only partial correspondence on individual criteria, with Kosminski's mental state (progressive schizophrenia) making his involvement in the 1888 murders extremely unlikely, and Tumblety did not reside permanently in Whitechapel. Druitt and James Kelly, despite their significance for the historiography of the case, do not correspond to the profile on most parameters.

Special attention deserves Joseph Barnett—Mary Kelly's cohabitant, interrogated by the police after her murder. In popular literature, he sometimes appears as a possible offender acting out of jealousy. However, his complete non-correspondence to the reconstructed profile (absence of anatomical knowledge, non-sexual motivation not established, absence of signs of seriality in subsequent biography) demonstrates the discriminant validity of the model: it can screen out even those candidates who appear plausible from an everyday perspective but do not correspond to the criminological pattern.

Aaron Kosminski's mental state during the period of the murders deserves special attention. According to available evidence, already in the autumn of 1888 he showed pronounced signs of mental disorder: auditory hallucinations, untidiness, disorganised behaviour, refusal of food. These symptoms are poorly compatible with the behaviour demonstrated by Jack the Ripper: the ability to quickly gain victims' trust, navigate dark alleys, avoid police patrols, and perform anatomically meaningful manipulations on the body. The psychotic disorganisation characteristic of Kosminski is not identical to the criminal audacity and calculation of the Ripper. Thus, even without reference to other criteria, Kosminski's mental state in 1888 makes his involvement in the Whitechapel murders extremely unlikely.

It is important to note that Chapman's high correspondence is not proof of his guilt—it is a basis for his priority consideration within the proposed explanatory model. The model itself does not depend on the identification of a specific person and retains its heuristic value regardless of whether Chapman was the Ripper.

Discussion and Limitations

The proposed model is not without limitations. The main one is the absence of direct evidence (witness statements seeing Chapman at the crime scene in 1888, or his confession). However, this problem is common to all versions of the Ripper case without exception.

Methodological Limitation: The Problem of Post Hoc Candidate Selection

The present study is vulnerable to criticism from the perspective of confirmation bias. George Chapman was chosen as the primary candidate post hoc—after his biography became known to the author, not as a result of a "blind" search based on the reconstructed profile. Since Chapman is the only proven serial killer among all Ripper suspects, his biography a priori contains traits that can be interpreted as "corresponding" to almost any profile of a serial offender.

Thus, the correspondence of the profile to Chapman's biography is not independent proof of his guilt—it is a consequence of a research strategy in which the candidate was known in advance. We cannot claim that the reconstructed profile inevitably leads to Chapman; we can only claim that among the limited circle of suspects whose names appeared in police

documents, Chapman demonstrates the greatest correspondence to the proposed explanatory model.

Testing the hypothesis would require a "blind" test: presenting the reconstructed profile to independent experts unfamiliar with the Ripper case, with the task of selecting suspects from an expanded database of Whitechapel residents in 1888. Such a test was not conducted and is unlikely to be possible within the framework of historical research. This limitation is insurmountable for any retrospective analysis and must be taken into account when assessing the strength of our conclusions.

The State of Criminology and Forensic Psychiatry in 1888

To objectively assess the strength of circumstantial evidence, it is necessary to consider the historical context. At the time of the Whitechapel murders, criminology was in its infancy. Fingerprinting was not yet used in police practice (its introduction began only in the 1890s), DNA analysis appeared a century later, and photographing crime scenes was just coming into use. The only method of identification was witness identification—an extremely unreliable tool, especially in the dark alleys of Whitechapel.

Forensic psychiatry was also in a period of formation. The classification of mental disorders was primitive; the term "serial killer" did not exist, and the phenomenon itself had not been conceptualised by science. Criminal behaviour was explained either by moral depravity or madness, and the police had no methods of psychological profiling that today allow linking outwardly dissimilar crimes by a single psychotype. It is precisely for this reason that the

1888 murders and the 1897–1902 poisonings were viewed by contemporaries as unrelated episodes, rather than as stages in the evolution of a single disorder.

This historical gap explains why even when Chief Inspector Abberline had suspicions, Chapman was not identified as the Ripper. The absence of direct evidence in a case investigated with the tools of the 19th century does not disprove the hypothesis, but makes reliance on circumstantial, psychological, and logical evidence inevitable.

Regarding the Date of Klosowski's Arrival in London

The first indisputable documentary confirmation of Klosowski's presence in London to date is the marriage certificate to Lucy Baderski from October 1889, as well as registration at 126 Cable Street, in immediate proximity to the scenes of all five canonical murders. Thus, within only 11 months after the last murder, Klosowski was officially residing in the very centre of Whitechapel.

This time interval is so short that the version of his arrival in London after November 1888 appears extremely unlikely: it requires the assumption that a person who had just emigrated immediately settled in an area that had recently been gripped by panic due to a series of murders, and at the same time did not stand out among the locals. Much more plausible is the assumption that Klosowski was already residing in Whitechapel in 1888 but remained "invisible" to official registers, like thousands of other poor migrants.

Moreover, the mass emigration of the Polish population (both Jews and Catholics) from Warsaw and other cities of the Russian Empire to London in the 1880s is well documented. The main wave arrived precisely at the ports of London and settled in the East End, primarily

Whitechapel, where an established Polish diaspora already existed. Thus, Klosowski's appearance in this area fully corresponded to the migration trends of the time, and his Polish origin made Whitechapel the most likely place of initial settlement. The absence of records of arrival and registration of low-skilled migrants in police and parish books was more the rule than the exception. The detailed reconstruction of Klosowski's biography conducted by Wojtczak (2014) confirms that his integration into the London environment (particularly in Southwark and Whitechapel) followed a path typical for poor Polish emigrants, with deliberate avoidance of official registers, which is corroborated by historical studies of East End migration.

Furthermore, Chief Inspector Frederick Abberline, who led the investigation on the scene, publicly stated in an interview with the Pall Mall Gazette (March 24, 1903) that Klosowski "lived in Whitechapel in 1888." This statement was made after Abberline's personal meeting with the arrested man and conversation with his wife Lucy Baderski. As a senior officer with access to confidential police information, Abberline would hardly have publicly reported an unverified fact at the risk of his reputation. Thus, his testimony is a serious basis for considering Klosowski's presence in the crime area as historically reliable.

Reconstruction of the Polish Period and Emigration Chronology

Analysis of available Polish sources and biographical research allows outlining with sufficient precision the time frames of Klosowski's disappearance from the documentary field of the Russian Empire.

The last reliable mention in Polish metric books dates to 1887 and is associated with his first marriage in the church of the village of Nagórki, followed by an immediate break with his wife. To the same period (1886–1887) belongs the completion of his training at a feldsher school in Warsaw and the receipt of a diploma as a "junior feldsher-surgeon."

After 1887, Klosowski completely disappears from Polish archives. His name is absent from Warsaw address books for 1888 (confirmed by modern Polish studies), and there are no records of obtaining a foreign passport, permission to leave, or legal proceedings. This means he left the territory of the empire either illegally or in transit, without formal paperwork—a practice widespread among poor migrants of the time.

As Sugden (1994) notes, Klosowski "disappears from Polish archives in 1887–1888," and his first reliable appearance in London dates to October 1889. Begg (2004) clarifies that the emigration was "most likely illegal – across the border with Austria-Hungary or Germany – which explains the absence of customs stamps."

Thus, the time gap between the last Polish record (1887) and the first British document (October 1889) is about one and a half to two years. If we assume that Klosowski left Poland in the spring-summer of 1888, then taking into account the standard travel time from Warsaw to London (2–3 weeks), he could physically have been in Whitechapel by August 1888—that is, by the time of the first canonical murder. This does not prove his guilt, but it removes the chronological counterargument: emigration in 1888 was physically possible and is consistent both with the migration patterns of the time and with the complete absence of documents about his stay anywhere else during this period.

Psychological Interpretation of the Chronology: Avoidant-Schizoid Trigger and Escalation

The presented chronology not only removes the formal alibi but also offers a psychologically rich interpretation of the events. The flight from his first wife immediately after marriage (1887) is not merely a biographical episode but the first documented manifestation of the avoidant-schizoid pattern—a panicked reaction to the threat of emotional intimacy. If we accept the hypothesis that Klosowski left Poland shortly after this break (winter-spring 1888), then his arrival in London and the first murder (Nichols, August 31, 1888) become links in one chain.

In this reconstruction, the Whitechapel prostitute becomes not a random victim but a functional substitute for the first wife. Transactional interaction with a prostitute (money → body) allowed realisation of sexual desire without the risk of emotional rapprochement—precisely what proved impossible in marriage. However, as the victimological analysis shows (see Victimological Analysis subsection), even such a "safe" form of possession was unstable: as soon as the woman manifested subjectivity, the mechanism of objectification and elimination was triggered.

Thus, the chronological sequence "flight from wife (1887) → emigration (1887–1888) → first murder (August 1888)" is not a random coincidence of dates. It reflects the escalation of the avoidant-schizoid pattern: from avoidance of intimacy through flight—to elimination of the source of anxiety through murder. Emigration to London acted as a catalyst, providing access to anonymous and vulnerable victims, and the feldsher profession provided the toolkit for the "pseudo-investigative" realisation of the motive.

A systematic search in the archives of the Łęczyca district, Warsaw Governorate, and possibly transit points on the Austro-Hungarian border remains a topic for a separate historical-criminological study, capable of definitively clarifying the exact date and route of Klosowski's emigration.

Documentary lacunae are the norm for low-status East End migrants—many figures in the case (including Kosminski) are known only from isolated mentions, which does not prevent them from being considered as suspects. Consequently, the question of Klosowski's presence in Whitechapel in 1888 cannot serve as a basis for a priori rejection of the hypothesis and remains open for further archival verification.

Regarding Anatomical Skills

Some revisions attribute higher qualifications to the Ripper. However, they do not take into account the extreme conditions (darkness, stress), where dexterity is more important than academicism. Moreover, for the "pseudo-investigative" type, self-learning is characteristic (Antonyan & Guldán, 1991). Chapman could have honed his skills precisely to the extent required for his curiosity.

Behavioural Invariance or Change of Modus: Can the Ripper and the Poisoner Be Identified?

The key conceptual challenge for our model is the thesis of the rigidity of the criminal signature, advocated both by classical FBI profiling (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000) and by some schools of investigative psychology (Canter, 1995). According to this view, the transition

from dynamic, bloody street mutilations to passive, time-extended domestic poisonings is unlikely for the same subject.

We accept this challenge and present a counterargument: in Chapman's case, the observed transformation is a change not of the "signature" but of the "modus operandi." His criminal "signature" is not the knife or the poison themselves, but the cold, unfeeling investigation and destruction of the object that evokes fear and attraction. This "signature" remains stable for 15 years. Only the toolkit changes, which is an adaptive response to changed external (increased police activity) and internal (exhaustion of anatomical "curiosity") conditions.

Moreover, Douglas and Olshaker (2000), without intending to, provided an argument in favour of our model. Their 1988 profile, describing the Whitechapel killer, almost verbatim predicted the appearance of George Chapman, arrested 15 years later. The fact that the profiler himself did not connect his own profile with Chapman speaks not of the weakness of the profile, but of the fact that the true "signature" may lie at a deeper motivational level than the specific behavioural act.

Signature in the Poisonings: "Medicalised Control" as an Invariant

A detailed analysis of the 1897–1902 poisonings reveals the same criminal signature as in the Whitechapel murders, but realised in a different instrumental form.

Chapman used antimony—a substance causing symptoms similar to food poisoning. He administered the poison in small doses, stretching the process over several weeks or months, and at the same time demonstratively cared for the sick, called doctors, and inquired in detail about symptoms. This behaviour is not disguise but an integral part of the

pseudo-investigative ritual. He did not simply kill; he observed the dying process, recorded stages, and compared effects.

In both cases, the signature is the same: control over the victim's body, realised through paramedical competence. In 1888, this is the competence of a surgeon-anatomist (rapid and precise organ removal). In 1897–1902, this is the competence of a feldsher-diagnostician (observation and "treatment" during poisoning). The difference lies solely in the temporal dimension: mutilation is an instantaneous act of cognition of the dead body; poisoning is a time-extended act of cognition of the dying process of the living body.

It is indicative that the choice of weapon in the second series is also directly linked to his professional training. Antimony was available to barbers and feldshers as part of products for treating skin and hair. Chapman not only knew about its toxicity—he knew dosages, speed of action, and clinical picture, which allowed him to avoid immediate detection.

Moreover, the poisonings contain the same element of depersonalisation of the victim as the knife attacks. For Chapman, the dying wife is not a suffering person but an object of clinical observation. His visits to doctors, his "concern" for the victim's health, his detailed descriptions of symptoms—all of this is part of the pseudo-investigative ritual in which he acts not as a killer but as a "specialist" studying the course of the disease.

This makes the link between the series indissoluble: the *modus operandi* changed (knife → poison, street → home), but the signature—medicalised control over the body, pseudo-investigative motive, absence of sexual violence—remained unchanged.

Under these conditions, the criterion becomes the explanatory power of the model. The presented model explains: absence of sexual violence; escalation of injuries; cessation of the series after Kelly; the nine-year hiatus; the change of murder weapon. None of the competing versions possesses comparable explanatory power.

Practical Significance of the Model for Contemporary Criminal Psychology and Education

The proposed model, despite its retrospective nature, has a number of implications significant for contemporary investigative, expert, and educational practice.

First, it offers an alternative explanation for those serial crimes in which traditional motives (sexual, mercenary, sadistic) are absent, and the offender's actions are outwardly meaningless but methodical. In such cases, the investigator or profiler may check not only the suspect's criminal past but also the presence in his biography of markers of the avoidant-schizoid pattern: panicked breakups of relationships when threatened with emotional rapprochement, threats to partners, instrumental attitude toward the body, social isolation with preserved sexual drive. These markers are specific and verifiable, making the model operational. The identified markers and mechanisms of objectification can be integrated into methodological recommendations for investigators and operational agents for the search of serial offenders committing murders without signs of sexual violence.

Markers of the Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern: Checklist for Operational Use

Based on the conducted analysis, the following empirical indicators can be identified, the presence of which in the biography of a suspect in cases of non-sexual serial murders warrants heightened attention:

1. Panicked breakups of relationships when threatened with rapprochement. The suspect in the past abruptly and without visible reasons broke off relationships, entered into marriage and immediately annulled it, left without explanation.
2. Instrumental attitude toward the body. Profession or hobby related to medicine, veterinary science, the meat industry, or barbering. Presence of anatomical knowledge or access to pharmacological substances.
3. Absence of close friendships. Complete social isolation outside the professional sphere. Absence of friends, confidants, participation in community or religious life.
4. Cold, detached description of one's actions. When giving testimony or in communication, the suspect describes violent actions in clinical, "technical" terms, without signs of empathy or remorse.
5. Preserved sexual drive with inability for intimacy. Presence of sexual contacts (including paid ones), but complete inability for long-term emotionally engaged relationships.

This checklist is not a formal diagnostic tool and is subject to empirical validation. It is intended for primary screening and formulation of investigative hypotheses, not for making procedural decisions.

Second, the model expands the understanding of the signature of a serial offender. Traditional profiling is oriented toward the stability of observed behavioural acts (method of attack, weapon, ritual). The present study demonstrates that when the modus operandi changes—for

example, when transitioning from a knife to poison—the signature may be preserved at a deeper motivational level. This means that when analysing cold cases or series from different regions, it is advisable to seek not only external similarity of actions but also the invariant dynamic of the relationship with the victim.

Third, the model contains a prognostic component. The combination of identified factors—avoidant-schizoid pattern, presence of special skills (medical, pharmacological), access to vulnerable or isolated victims, and complete social isolation—can be considered a matrix of elevated risk. In forensic psychiatric examination and in the assessment of persons convicted of violent crimes against partners, the presence of such a combination may serve as a basis for more in-depth diagnosis and monitoring.

Finally, the work has pronounced didactic value. The present study can serve as a ready-made case study for courses in criminal profiling, legal psychology, and criminology. It demonstrates to learners the full cycle of applying the method: from operationalisation of features to profile construction, its verification through convergence with an independent expert assessment, and illustrative comparison with a real biography. In this capacity, the work can be integrated into educational programmes of universities and advanced training centres.

Conditions of Inapplicability and Possible Refutations of the Model

A scientific hypothesis is the more convincing the more clearly it defines its own boundaries. The proposed model is not universal and has clear limitations.

Conditions under which the avoidant-schizoid pattern does not lead to serial murders:

- presence of social brakes (friendships, community involvement);
- absence of special skills that turn the body into an object of cognition (medical, pharmacological);
- presence of alternative channels of sublimation (professional realisation, hobbies);
- low intensity of the pattern, not reaching the level of compulsive drive.

Facts in the Ripper case potentially contradicting the model:

- features of the throat wound of Eddowes and other anomalies that may indicate a higher level of disorganisation than the profile suggests.

The problem of letters and graffiti: from counterargument to additional verification. The presence of expressive communication attributed to the killer is traditionally considered a counterargument against the Chapman hypothesis. Cold objectification of the victim and the absence of affect are poorly compatible with the need for public dialogue. However, analysis of the key artifact—the "From Hell" letter with a kidney fragment—allows removing this objection.

- Context and motivation. The "Dear Boss" and "Saucy Jacky" letters, almost certainly journalistic hoaxes (Begg, 2004; Sugden, 1994), could have provoked the genuine offender into a response. However, the response was directed not to a newspaper but to a private individual—G. Lusk—which corresponds to the publicity-avoiding profile.
- Linguistic observation. The letter's errors ("Mishter," "Sor," "prasarved," missing articles) are compatible with the hypothesis of the author's Slavic origin, but are not proof: similar errors are possible in uneducated Cockney speakers or speakers of other languages. We present this observation as not contradicting the model, rather than as a decisive argument.

- Content and medical aspects. The tone of the letter is detached, almost clinical, which is consistent with the pseudo-investigative signature. Preservation of the kidney in alcohol indicates paramedical competence, which Klosowski possessed.

Data capable of refuting the model:

- documentary confirmation of Klosowski's presence outside London in August–November 1888. The most promising sources for such verification are: metric books of Catholic parishes of the Łęczyca district and Warsaw for 1888 (records of participation in sacraments); passenger lists of ships arriving from Hamburg and Bremen to the port of London in 1887–1889; registration books of the Polish Catholic mission in London; records of hiring barber assistants in Whitechapel for 1888.
- discovery of DNA or other evidence pointing to another person at the scene of the canonical murders;
- appearance of evidence that Chapman committed violent crimes in 1889–1896 that do not fit the avoidant-schizoid pattern model.

The clear definition of these conditions and falsifiers shows that the model is not an ad hoc explanation but can be tested and, potentially, refuted by future research.

Conclusion

The present study is an attempt to demonstrate how the retrospective psychological profiling method can be applied to historical material. We reconstructed the psychological profile of the unknown offender, compared it with an independent FBI expert assessment, and

illustrated the operation of the model using the biography of George Chapman—the only proven serial killer among the Ripper suspects.

The proposed model, linking the avoidant-schizoid personality pattern, the mechanism of objectification, and the pseudo-investigative motive, does not claim to be the ultimate truth. It is the most economical and internally consistent explanation of the known facts. The work is not an attempt at legal identification; its purpose is to serve as a didactic tool and heuristic foundation for further research.

The convergence of two independent profiles testifies to the reliability of the reconstructed portrait, but is not proof of the guilt of any specific person. This important methodological distinction should prevent misinterpretations in the media space.

All conclusions are exclusively hypothetical. The question of Jack the Ripper's identity remains as open as is at all possible for events separated from us by a century and leaving no direct evidence.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). **Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders** (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Publishing.

Antonyan, Yu. M., & Guldán, V. V. (1991). **Kriminal'naya patopsikhologiya** [Criminal pathopsychology]. Nauka.

Begg, P. (2004). **Jack the Ripper: The facts**. Robson Books.

Bukhanovsky, A. O. (1998). O probleme seriynykh ubiystv [On the problem of serial killings]. **Rossiyskiy Psikhiatricheskiy Zhurnal**, *2*, 63–68.

Canter, D. (1995). **Criminal shadows: Inside the mind of the serial killer**. HarperCollins.

Douglas, J., & Olshaker, M. (2000). **The cases that haunt us: From Jack the Ripper to JonBenet Ramsey, the FBI's legendary mindhunter sheds light on the mysteries that won't go away**. Scribner.

Evans, S. P., & Skinner, K. (2001). **The ultimate Jack the Ripper sourcebook: An illustrated encyclopedia**. Robinson.

Fido, M. (1987). **The crimes, detection and death of Jack the Ripper**. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Gordon, R. M. (2001). **Alias Jack the Ripper: Beyond the usual Whitechapel suspects**. McFarland.

Gordon, R. M. (2002). **The Thames torso murders of Victorian London**. McFarland.

Knight, S. (1976). **Jack the Ripper: The final solution**. Harrap.

Marriott, T. (2005). **Jack the Ripper: The 21st century investigation**. John Blake.

Rumbelow, D. (2004). **The complete Jack the Ripper**. Penguin Books.

Smulevich, A. B. (2009). Trevozhno-fobicheskiye rasstroystva [Anxiety-phobic disorders]. In T. B. Dmitrieva, V. N. Krasnov, N. G. Neznakov, V. Ya. Semke, & A. S. Tiganov (Eds.), **Psikhiatriya: Natsional'noye rukovodstvo** [Psychiatry: National guideline] (Vol. 1, pp. 402–423). GEOTAR-Media.

Sugden, P. (1994). **The complete history of Jack the Ripper**. Robinson.

Wojtczak, H. (2014). **Jack the Ripper at last? The mysterious murders of George Chapman**. Hastings Press.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses gratitude to the language model DeepSeek (deepseek.com), used exclusively for the translation of this text and stylistic editing. All conceptual positions, source analysis, and scientific conclusions are the original work of the author.